

## Curriculum Committee Minutes

March 4, 2015

Committee members attending: Richard Anderson-Connolly, Rob Beezer, Luc Boisvert, Nancy Bristow, Gwynne Brown, Jane Carlin, Lisa Ferrari, Sara Freeman, Lisa Johnson, Nick Kontogeorgopoulos, Alan Krause, Julia Looper, Elise Richman, Brett Rogers, Allison Simmons, Brad Tomhave

Also attending: Lisa Hutchinson

**1) Call to Order** at 8:00 a.m.

**2) Remarks from the Chair**

Freeman contacted Senate Chair Ariela Tubert about approving a new major format. Tubert said that it was up to the CC to decide whether to approve it ourselves or bring it to a faculty meeting first. If the CC were to approve it, as with any other Senate standing committee action, the Senate would have 30 days to take action, and the faculty could decide to weigh in as well. It might be nice to let faculty know about such a change.

**3) M/S/P to approve the minutes from the 2/25/15 CC meeting**

**4) Working Group Reports**

**WG1:** Bristow reported that the WG is working on the Asian Studies and Hispanic Studies reviews.

**M/S/P:**

To implement the option of fulfilling the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement by the successful completion of two semesters of a foreign language at the 101-102 college level, the Registrar's Office may substitute a single transferred first or second quarter of a 100 college level foreign language course for the 101 level semester provided the student successfully completes a semester of that foreign language at the 102 college level.

In discussion:

- "Successfully" means D- or better. Must be graded.
- This language will be used by the Registrar's Office, to take burden off students and FL faculty.
- Roughly 10 students a year are likely to be affected.

**WG2:** Kontogeorgopoulos reported that the WG met last Thursday and is continuing to discuss the proposal for an AFAM major.

**WG3:** Looper reported that the WG met Thursday to continue its review of SOAN. The review of the Math Approaches core is continuing. A CONN course is in progress. The WG will meet Friday.

**WG4:** Rogers brought forward a course for approval as an SSI 1.

**M/S/P to approve SSI 177,** Laura Krughoff (English): “What is Marriage for?”

Rogers said the Theatre Arts review and BMB reviews are proceeding.

### **5) Curriculum Impact Statement (attached as Appendix 1)**

Rogers said that this has been underway for a long time. One major change to the most recent version is that it doesn't ask very specific questions about resources, because that isn't the CC's purview; Item #4 only initiates the conversation. Also, in drafting the CIS, WG4 has attempted to make the language less discouraging to those proposing new courses of study, while also facilitating rigorous conversation about the implications of a new program being put in place. Rogers invited feedback, questions.

**M/S** to accept CIS language.

In discussion, a member commented that Purpose #2 (“aware of the implications”) doesn't require support from “principal stakeholders” but only awareness. She noted that Required Item #3 inconsistently requires “Letters of support.” Another member suggested deleting “of support,” and Rogers accepted this revision.

### **Motion passed unanimously.**

Freeman said that this vote is for implementation; in 30 days, if no senator or faculty member asks for further discussion, it will go into effect. The CIS will go into the CC minutes, but where else might it go online so that it would be easily accessible to those making proposals in the future?

After some discussion (new webpage for proposers? PeopleSoft? SoundNet?), Freeman said she would follow up on this question. One of CC's key goals for this year is to make sure our work is accessible and therefore useful in the future. We need to communicate about things like this (through Senate, facultycoms, etc.) so people know that resources like the CIS exist. By summertime we will figure out what will be created as a result of this year, or charged to next year's CC.

## 6) Linked Major Category

Kontogeorgopoulos distributed some draft language (see Appendix 2). He reported that Dan Sherman, chair of EPDM, said the ENVR major proposers are fine with whatever the CC wants to impose in terms of double-counting. Kontogeorgopoulos noted that most departments allow up to 2 units to be double-counted, so allowing 4 would mark a Linked Interdisciplinary Major (LIM) as distinct and more liberal, but not so open as to become a glorified emphasis; it would maintain its integrity as a major.

In discussion, in addition to some wordsmithing, the following points were raised:

- The “linked interdisciplinary major” language sets up a desirable parallel with SIMs.
- We might not need a whole new category; although the ENVR major seems like a good idea, having it be open to linkage with any primary major creates the potential for tenuous connections between the two.
- Allowing double-counting with the core (not just for another major or minor) would make doing a LIM maximally possible.
- Would a LIM have to be for disciplines that are diffuse and still in-formation like Environmental Studies?
- Should IPE be a LIM? (Kontogeorgopoulos: 20 years ago, it probably should have been; now it’s a very coherent discipline and makes sense as a standalone major.)
- It would be possible for LIMs to evolve into standalone majors.
- If the proposers thought ENVR would be strong as a standalone major, they would propose it. It is, however, commonly done in this way elsewhere.
- A lot of emerging disciplines (e.g. bioethics, African American studies, neuroscience) are interdisciplinary, and we don’t have resources for all of these majors. But if students want such things, it would be good to have a mechanism that would enable us to create these avenues of study.
- Instead of creating LIMs, perhaps students who are committed to interdisciplinary studies such as Environmental Studies should create a SIM.
- Response: SIMs are individual; ENVR is of interest to many people.
- Perhaps ENVR could be a major with a contract, so that there would be an up-front design for a standalone major.
- Response: This wouldn’t deal with the problem of disciplinary shallowness. The proposers considered the contract major idea, but felt that the linked major was preferable.
- Several comments asking why ENVR should be a major (and not a minor, emphasis, etc.) elicited reminders that (1) the administration wants an ENVR major; (2) a grant assisted the development of an ENVR major; (3) students really want an ENVR major; (4) Puget Sound is the only NW5 school without an ENVR major.
- Maybe Puget Sound should stop offering emphases and change these to linked majors.

Freeman noted that the CC does not seem to be ready to vote on this, but perhaps next week. CC members were encouraged to communicate with Kontogeorgopoulos and Freeman if they had comments or questions that might help move things along. Kontogeorgopoulos stated that members should feel comfortable voting however they wish. Freeman acknowledged that the approval or rejection of proposed new majors can be sensitive, but the CC is not obligated to approve.

**7) M/S/P to adjourn at 8:50.**

Submitted by Gwynne Brown